

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 10-14, 15 and 19-21 have been amended as shown on pages 2-7 of the Reply. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification as filed at Fig.3. and paragraph [0047] in the specification as filed.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the teleconference of June 19, 2008 wherein merits of the claims vis-à-vis the cited documents were discussed in addition to discussing statutory subject matter issues with respect to claims 10, 19.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection of Claim 10

Claim 10 is objected to because of minor informalities. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claim 10 has been amended to cure the minor informalities, and in view of this, the rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 10-14 and 19-21 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 10-14 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Amended independent claims 10 and 19 recite similar features, namely ***computer object sharing software stored in computer readable media*** comprising instructions for storing and sharing the context association information. The system performs sharing of context association information between object from a first computer space to a second computer space, which is concrete, tangible and useful. From the foregoing, it is clear that the subject claims recite statutory subject matter that produces a useful, concrete and tangible result. Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 6-10 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 3, 6-10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kenyon, *et al.* (US 6,792,430 B1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Kenyon *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation* set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.* *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant's claimed subject matter teaches a method of sharing computer objects between different computer spaces. To this end, independent claim 1 recites *storing association information relating to one or more associations between a selected object in a first computer space and one or more first objects in the first computer space, wherein the association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between the user and the objects in the first computer space, and wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contact and communications; sharing the selected object from the first computer space with a second computer space, the second computer space including at least one of the first objects; identifying in the second computer space the one or more first objects; and automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space the one or more associations in the first computer space between the selected object and the at least one first object in the second computer space.* Independent claim 10 recites similar features. Kenyon *et al.* does not disclose such claim features.

Kenyon *et al.* provides for a method of generating a navigational model for linking together information objects on an existing information space. At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Kenyon *et al.* discloses novel features of applicant's claimed invention. Applicant's representative avers to the contrary. In accordance with the subject invention, the system stores association information relating to associations between a user and

objects in the first computer space is stored. The computer objects can be computer files, contacts, applications, computer communications etc., and the system automatically determines the association information, *based on prior interactions between the user and the objects in the first computer space*. When an object from the first computer is shared with a second computer space that already contains at least one of the objects in the first computer space, such shared objects are initially identified and the association information between the copied object and the other shared objects in the second computer space that are associated with the copied object, is also shared. At the cited portions, Kenyon *et al.* discloses a user generating an overlay for organizing and navigating digital information objects from a user's perspective, using concept nodes. The user creates an overlay with concepts, each concept has a node described by at least one keyword. When the user accesses an object such as a page on the WWW specified by a URL, the object is checked for the occurrence of the keywords in the overlay, if keywords are found, an association is made with other objects in the nodes described by that keyword and the object is dynamically and automatically linked to each concept node that has a common concept with the object. In contrast, the claimed invention discloses a context association system that automatically determines association information based upon prior interactions between the user and the objects.

Further, Kenyon *et al.* discloses that the overlay can be shared with others and can also be downloaded as a file. Hence, by sharing an overlay between users, Kenyon *et al.* allows *an object and its associations to concepts*, to be shared between different users. However, in accordance with the claimed subject matter, based upon user interactions with the objects, the system automatically determines contextual association information. When a selected object is shared with a second computer space, and if the second computer space already contains at least one of the objects in the first computer space, such shared objects are identified and the associations between the shared object and existing object common to both the computer spaces are then automatically shared. This allows the associations between the objects to be used in the new computer space to access the shared functionality between the objects. Therefore, it can be concluded that Kenyon *et al.* is silent regarding *storing association information relating to one or more associations between a selected object in a first computer space and one or more first objects in the first computer space, wherein the association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between the user and the objects in the first*

computer space, and sharing the selected object from the first computer space with a second computer space, the second computer space including at least one of the first objects; identifying in the second computer space the one or more first objects; and automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space the one or more associations in the first computer space between the selected object and the at least one first object in the second computer space as recited by the subject claims.

From the foregoing, it is clear that an identical invention as recited in the subject claims is not disclosed or suggested by Kenyon *et al.* Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection with respect to independent claims 1, and 10 (and the claims that depend there from) should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 2, 5, 11 and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2, 5, 11 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenyon, *et al.* (US 6,792,430 B1) in view of Batty, *et al.* (US 6,223,212 B1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claims 2, 5, 11 and 14 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed *supra*, Kenyon *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest all features of amended independent claims 1 and 10. Batty *et al.* relates to techniques for coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.* Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claims 4 and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenyon, *et al.* (US 6,792,430 B1) in view of Batty, *et al.* (US 6,223,212 B1) as applied to claims 3 and 12 above, and further in view of Hatori (US 2003/00221122 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Kenyon *et al.*, Batty *et al.* and Hatori *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

Claims 4 and 13 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed *supra*, Kenyon *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest all features of amended independent claims 1 and 10. Batty *et al.* relates to techniques for coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems, and fails to make up for the

aforementioned deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.* Hatori *et al.* relates to a computer enhancing a security level when connecting to a network, and fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.* and Batty *et al.* Additionally, it is erroneously contended on page 9 of the subject Office Action that Hatori discloses a file sharing device. However, at the cited portion Hatori teaches a simple file download/execution on/off switching device that enables or disables download of files via a network based on a user specification or on security information related to the network recognized by a network recognition device. Hatori fails to teach or suggest *automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space the intervening first object, together with the direct association between the selected object and the intervening first object and the direct association between the intervening first object and the particular first object* as recited in claims 4 and 13.

The claimed aspects allow a shared object to be used in the second computer space with the same association-based functionality as in the first computer space including association –based security, association-based linking of related object, association –based accessing of objects etc. (See applicant's specification as filed paragraph [0050]). Such aspects are neither suggested nor taught either alone or in combination by the cited documents. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

VI. Rejection of Claims 15-17 and 19-21 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 15-17 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenyon, *et al.* (US 6,792,430 B1) in view of Hatori (US 2003/00221122 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Kenyon *et al.* and Hatori *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

Independent claim 15 recites *in a context association system for forming context associations between first and second objects that are stored in computer memory and are associated with each other based on user computer interactions, a method of sharing computer objects, comprising: storing association information relating to one or more associations between a selected object in a first computer space and a second computer space, wherein the association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between the user and the objects in the first computer space, and wherein the*

objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts or communications; initiating sharing of the selected object from the first computer space with the second computer space; determining whether the association of the selected object with the second computer space is of an extent greater than a predetermined threshold; and interfering with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold. Independent claim 19 recites similar features. Kenyon *et al.* and Hatori *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

Kenyon *et al.* discloses a method of generating a navigational model for linking together information objects on an existing information space. As discussed *supra* with respect to independent claim 1, Kenyon *et al.* does not teach *storing association information relating to one or more associations between a selected object in a first computer space and a second computer space, wherein the association information is determined automatically based upon interactions between the user and the objects* as recited by the subject claims. The Examiner cites Hatori *et al.* to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.*

Hatori *et al.* relates to a computer enhancing a security level when connecting to a network. At the cited portions, Hatori *et al.* discloses a user setting security information in association with a network connection to be used, storing the security information in a predetermined memory and disabling processes related to sharing files, performed by other network connected computers based on the stored security information. However, Hatori *et al.* is silent regarding teach *storing association information relating to one or more associations between a selected object in a first computer space and a second computer space, wherein the association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between the user and the objects in the first computer space,.... interfering with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold* as recited by the subject claims.

From the foregoing, it is clear that Kenyon *et al.* and Hatori *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the subject claims. Accordingly, it is requested that this

rejection with respect to independent claims 15 and 19 (and the claims that depend there from) should be withdrawn.

VII. Rejection of Claim 18 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenyon, *et al.* in view of Hatori and further in view of Batty, *et al.* Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claim 18 depends from independent claims 15. As discussed *supra*, Kenyon *et al.* and Hatori, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all features of independent claim 15. Batty *et al.* relates to techniques for coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.* and Hatori. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP685US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731